



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/886,741	06/21/2001	Vincent Chan	ATI.0100680	6028

7590

04/29/2003

Christopher J. Reckamp, Esq.
VEDDER, PRICE, KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ
222 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601

EXAMINER

CHU, CHRIS C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2815

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2003

20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/886,741

Applicant(s)

CHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Chris C. Chu

Art Unit

2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2 - 14, 16 - 20, 22 - 40, 44 - 48 and 50 - 59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2 - 6, 8, 9, 11, 16 - 18, 20, 23, 44 - 47, 53, 54 and 56 - 59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are 7, 10, 12 - 14, 19, 22, 24 - 40, 48, 50 - 52 and 55.

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. A request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 13, 2003 has been entered. An action on the RCE follows.

2. Applicant's amendment filed on February 20, 2003 has been received and entered in the case.

Election/Restrictions

3. Claims 7, 10, 12 ~ 14, 19, 22, 24 ~ 40, 48, 50 ~ 52 and 55 continue to be withdrawn from consideration for the reasons provided in the Office action mailed on August 14, 2002.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 16, "the packaged memory" should be --the packaged semiconductor--.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 3 ~ 6, 8, 9, 17, 18, 20, 44, 46, 47, 53, 54, and 56 ~ 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanioka.

Regarding claim 56, Tanioka discloses in Figs. 2A ~ 2C a device comprising:

- a package module (a structure in Fig. 2A) including a substrate (19) having a standard package footprint;
- an unpackaged semiconductor die (2) directly attached to the package module, the unpackaged semiconductor die encapsulated (16) onto the package module in a structure having a planar top surface; and
- a packaged semiconductor die (17) having a top surface and attached to the package module;

- wherein the planar top surface of the encapsulated structure and the top surface of the packaged semiconductor die are of equal distance from the substrate.

Regarding claim 3, since Tanioka does not limit the unpackaged semiconductor die to any particular or specific device, hence his/her disclosure encompasses all well known semiconductor die's including a "graphics-processor."

Regarding claim 4, since Tanioka does not limit the packaged semiconductor die to any particular or specific device, hence his/her disclosure encompasses all well known semiconductor die's including a "memory."

Regarding claim 5, Tanioka discloses in Fig. 2A a plurality of packaged semiconductors (17) being attached to the package module.

Regarding claim 6, Tanioka discloses in Fig. 2A the unpackaged semiconductor die (2) being wire (15) bonded to the package module.

Regarding claims 8 and 20, the phrase "wherein attached includes surface-mount technology reflow" is product-by-process limitation. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based upon the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product is made by a different process. In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted). A "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, In re Hirao, **190 USPQ 15 at 17** (footnote 3). See also In re Brown, **173 USPQ 685**; In re Luck, **177 USPQ 523**; In re Fessmann, **180 USPQ 324**; In re Avery, **186 USPQ 116**; In re Wertheim, **191 USPQ 90** (**209 USPQ 254** does not deal

with this issue); and In re Marosi et al., **218 USPQ 289** final product per se which must be determined in a “product by, all of” claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product, whether claimed in “product by process” claims or not. Note that Applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above caselaw makes clear.

Regarding claim 9, Tanioka discloses in Fig. 2A the encapsulated structure (2) having a footprint greater than the footprint of the unpackaged semiconductor die (17).

Regarding claim 57, Tanioka discloses in Figs. 2A ~ 2C a device comprising:

- a package module (a structure at Fig. 2A);
- a die (2) directly attached to the package module, the die encapsulated (16) on the package module in a structure having a planar top surface; and
- a packaged die (17) having a top surface and attached to the package module;
- wherein the planar top surface of the encapsulated structure and the top surface of the packaged memory die are of equal distance from the package module.

Further, the phrase “sized to be interchangeable with standard package sizes” is intended use language which does not differentiate the claimed apparatus over Tanioka. Furthermore, since Tanioka does not limit the unpackaged semiconductor die to be any particular or specific device, hence his/her disclosure encompasses all well known semiconductor die’s including a “graphics-processor die.” Finally, since Tanioka does not limit the packaged semiconductor die to be any particular or specific device, hence his/her disclosure encompasses all well known semiconductor die’s including a “memory die.”

Regarding claim 17, Tanioka discloses in Fig. 2A a plurality of packaged memory (17) being attached to the package module.

Regarding claim 18, Tanioka discloses in Fig. 2A directly attached including the graphics processing die (2) being wire (15) bonded to the package module.

Regarding claim 58, Tanioka discloses in Figs. 2A ~ 2C a multi-die module, comprising:

- a substrate (19) having a first surface and a second surface;
- an unpackaged semiconductor die (2) mounted to the first surface of the substrate, the semiconductor die encapsulated (16) in a structure having a planar top surface; and
- a packaged semiconductor die (17) having a top surface and mounted on the first surface of the substrate;
- wherein the planar top surface of the encapsulated structure and the top surface of the packaged semiconductor die are of equal distance from the substrate.

Regarding claim 44, Tanioka discloses in Fig. 2A further including a second packaged semiconductor die mounted on the first surface of the substrate.

Regarding claim 46, Tanioka discloses in Fig. 2A the unpackaged semiconductor die being mounted to the first surface of the substrate by wire (15) bonding.

Regarding claim 47, Tanioka discloses in Fig. 2A and column 1, line 43 the encapsulating structure (16) being further comprised of an encapsulating material including epoxy, metal cap or silicon coatings.

Regarding claim 53, since Tanioka does not limit the unpackaged semiconductor die to be any particular or specific device, hence his/her disclosure encompasses all well known semiconductor die's including a "graphics-processor."

Regarding claim 54, since Tanioka does not limit the packaged semiconductor die to be any particular or specific device, hence his/her disclosure encompasses all well known semiconductor die's including a "memory."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2, 16 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanioka in view of Fallon et al.

Regarding claims 2 and 16, Tanioka discloses the semiconductor package set forth in the claims except for the packaged semiconductor being packaged in a ball grid array package. However, Fallon et al. discloses in Fig. 46 a packaged semiconductor (862) being packaged in a ball grid array package. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to modify Tanioka by using the ball grid array package for the packaged semiconductor as taught by Fallon et al. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Tanioka in the manner described above for at least the purpose of increasing a bond strength between the packaged semiconductor and the substrate.

Regarding claim 45, Tanioka discloses the semiconductor package set forth in the claims except for a plurality of unpackaged semiconductor die mounted on the first surface of the

substrate. However, Fallon et al. discloses in column 37, lines 48 and 49 a plurality of unpackaged semiconductor die mounted on the first surface of the substrate. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to modify Tanioka by using the plurality of unpackaged semiconductor die as taught by Fallon et al. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Tanioka in the manner described above for at least the purpose of increasing power and speed of the module.

9. Claims 11 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanioka in view of Takano et al.

Regarding claims 11 and 23, Tanioka discloses the semiconductor package set forth in the claims except for the standard package sizes being 40mm X 40mm. However, Takano et al. discloses in TABLE 1 a standard package sizes being 40mm X 40mm. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to modify Tanioka by using the standard package sizes as taught by Takano et al. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Tanioka in the manner described above for at least the purpose of reducing a limitation in the size of a semiconductor chip (column 2, lines 6 and 7).

10. Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanioka in view of Distefano.

Regarding claim 59, Tanioka discloses in Figs. 2A ~ 2C a multi-die module, comprising:

- a substrate (19) having a first surface;

- an unpackaged semiconductor die (2) mounted to the first surface of the substrate, the semiconductor die encapsulated (16) in a structure; and
- a packaged semiconductor die (17) mounted on the first surface of the substrate.

Tanioka does not disclose the encapsulating structure being further comprised of an encapsulating material of a metal cap. However, Distefano discloses in Fig. 2 and column 4, line 21 ~ 33 an encapsulating structure being further comprised of an encapsulating material of a metal cap (20). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to modify Tanioka by using the metal cap as taught by Distefano. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Tanioka in the manner described above for at least the purpose of providing a thermal spreader (column 1, lines 45 ~ 50).

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2, 16 and 45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Stoller, Brillhart and Maruyama et al. disclose a semiconductor module.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chris C. Chu whose telephone number is (703) 305-6194. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10:30 - 7:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie C. Lee can be reached on (703) 308-1690. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7382 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Chris C. Chu
Examiner
Art Unit 2815

c.c.
April 28, 2003



EDDIE LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800